

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/500,398

Applicant(s)

BUSHBY, MAXWELL

Examiner

Robert J. Hicks

Art Unit

3709

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Robert J. Hicks.

(3) _____.

(2) John Galbreath.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 30 May 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 2.

Identification of prior art discussed: Barker (4,516,689) and Hayes (5,267,662).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: 1) An agreement was made in the type of prior art references used, but the concern was the office action write-up had conflicting patent numbers with inventive entities. The Hayes prior art reference used was 5,267,662 (not 4,516,689 which is to Barker). 2) The reference to Hayes pointed out a reference 22, which is to a vulcanized sealant. The examiner wanted to note the thickness of the base, which is in reference 16 and 18, for Claim 1. Attorney Galbreath wanted a new corrected office action as well as a time action reset. The examiner followed up with the attorney with a voicemail message on June 5th, at 10:15 AM, stating that the time action reset would be granted, and that the period for reply will be three (3) months .

